DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 045 JC 920 498

AUTHOR Richardson, Richard C., Jr.

TITLE Creating Effective Learning Environments. Report of a Study Funded by the Ford Foundation.

INSTITUTION Arizona State Univ., Tempe. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 27 Oct 92
NOTE 48p.
AVAILABLE FROM Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-2411 ($8.80; quantity price: $7.04).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; Case Studies; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Educational Environment; Equal Education; *Faculty College Relationship; Governance; National Surveys; Questionnaires; School Policy; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Influence; Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In 1987, Arizona State University initiated a national study of two-year college faculty behaviors that contribute to educational equity. During phase 1 of the study, field interviews and a literature review were used to develop an inventory of effective faculty behaviors. To determine the emphasis placed on these behaviors, phase 2 consisted of a survey of faculty at 52 community colleges nationwide, producing usable responses from 67% of the faculty. In order to identify the relationship between effective faculty behaviors and administrative policy and practice, phase 3 consisted of case studies of 12 community colleges, involving site visits, interviews, and an examination of college documents. Effective faculty behaviors were examined in the areas of outreach and student recruiting; mentoring and advising; academic support; campus climate; student assessment; good teaching practices; adaptive instruction; and emphasizing achievement. Study findings included the following: (1) at all institutions, faculty reported high involvement in student assessment, good teaching practices, and in emphasizing achievement; (2) faculty reported lower levels of involvement in mentoring and advisement, and campus climate activities; and (3) faculty members reported higher involvement in effective behaviors at colleges at which faculty and administrative values did not conflict. The report includes in-depth analyses of faculty working conditions, role definitions, evaluation and reward systems, organizational structure, governance, and professional development opportunities as they relate to effective faculty behaviors. Recommendations for achieving and maintaining effective learning environments, the survey instrument, and data tables are included. (PAA)

ED350045

CREATING EFFECTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

Report of a Study Funded by the Ford Foundation

Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Education Policy Studies Laboratory
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85287

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. C. Richardson Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Richard C. Richardson Jr.

October 27, 1992

JC920498

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface	1
Introduction	3
Design of the Study	4
The Case study Participants	5
Culture and Effective Faculty Behaviors	7
Culture as an Influence on Faculty Behaviors	7
Defining Effective Faculty Behaviors	11
Determinants of Community College Culture	17
Working Conditions and Role Definition	17
Evaluation Systems and Rewards	18
Faculty Structure	20
The Special Case of Multiple Campus Districts	22
Faculty Involvement in Governance	24
Professional Development	27
Predicting Effective Faculty Behaviors	29
Creating Effective Learning Environments	31
References	35
Appendix A Educational Goals and Faculty Activities in the Community College	36

List of Tables

		Page
Table 1:	Characteristics of Case Study Institutions	6
Table 2	Faculty Behaviors: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Case Study Institutions and the 52 Institution Sample	14
Table 3	Faculty Behaviors: Institutional Ranks .	16
Table 4	Involvement in Governance: Institutional Ranks	26
Table 5	Participation in Professional Development: Institutional Ranks . . .	29
Table 6	Involvement in Governance and Professional Development as Predictors of Faculty Behaviors	30

Preface

The study described in this report was funded by the Ford Foundation. At different stages of the study, both Alison Bernstein and Steven Zwerling provided essential encouragement and support. The study reflects several of the important priorities the Foundation has pursued with vigor and remarkable success for more than a decade: community colleges, diversity, and excellence especially in programs leading to the baccalaureate degree. While the study could not have been conducted without the active support of the Foundation, the conclusions are solely those of the author.

The study depended upon collaboration with 52 community colleges in the faculty behaviors survey and, from among this group, ten institutions that agreed to host case studies. They were later joined by two additional community colleges from outside the original sample. While I am deeply indebted to all who contributed to the study, the extraordinary group of institutions that contributed their experiences and insights through the site visits and interviews deserve special thanks. The 12 institutions and their respective cooperating researchers were:

Bronx Community College of the City University of New York, New York City
Allen Pomerantz, Professor

El Paso Community College, El Paso, Texas
Robert Starke, Counselor

Essex County College, Newark, New Jersey
Scott Drakulich, Head Counselor

Erie Community College of the State University of New York, Buffalo, New York
Marlene Arno, Director of Institutional Research

Northern Essex Community College, Haverhill, Massachusetts
Robert McDonald, Dean of Instruction

Penn Valley Community College of the Metropolitan Community Colleges, Kansas City, Missouri
Ellen Forrest, Director of Instructional Services

Richland College of the Dallas County Community College District, Dallas, Texas
Jackie Claunch, Dean of Instruction

Sacramento City College of the Los Rios Community College District, Sacramento, California
Lawrence Hendrick, Dean of Instruction - Instructional Services

Sinclair Community College, Dayton, Ohio
Bonnie Johnson, Dean of Extended Learning & Human Services

Triton College, River Grove, Illinois
Nancy McNerney, Associate Director of Research

Valencia Community College, Orlando, Florida
Ronald Nelson, Title III Retention

Wayne Community College, Goldsboro, North Carolina
Bill Thompson, Director Planning and Research

Several individuals from other community colleges also provided help to the project. Bob McCabe, president of Miami-Dade Community College, and Mardee Jenrette, Director of the Miami-Dade Teaching/Learning Project generously shared the insights they had gained from more than two years of related work that preceded the beginning of this project. Administrators and faculty members from the Miami-Dade Community College District, Maricopa Community Colleges, Compton College in California, and the Hawaii Community Colleges provided assistance in the development and piloting of the survey.

Three doctoral students at Arizona State University have made important contributions to the project. Diana Elliott did the preliminary field work that produced the faculty survey. Donald Vangsnes developed and piloted the survey. Brian Murphy supervised survey administration and recovery from the 52-institution sample and performed most of the statistical analysis.

Alice Shepard, administrative assistant, was a key contributor to all phases of the project.

CREATING EFFECTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

Richard C. Richardson Jr.

Introduction

The effectiveness of any learning environment is largely determined by the quality of the interactions students experience with faculty members. For commuting students, this is the only part of the college environment most encounter with any regularity. Systematic attention to identifying and cultivating faculty behaviors essential to student achievement is a relatively recent phenomenon for most community colleges. Miami-Dade has received national attention for its teaching/learning project (McCabe 1990) which linked faculty rewards to effective behaviors for the first time in the Fall of 1992.

The study reported in this monograph identifies qualitative differences in the teaching and learning environments of twelve community colleges by examining the behaviors reported by faculty members. The study then traces the relationships between institutional policies, administrative practices and effective learning environments.

Effectiveness, as used in this report, refers to the absence of variation between accepted standards for high quality learning environments and the way faculty and administrators described the learning environment in a particular institution.

This first section of the report describes the study and introduces the institutions that participated. In the second section, the case study institutions are introduced more fully and data from all three phases of the study are combined to provide a comprehensive portrait of faculty behaviors that impact on student access and achievement.

A third section examines faculty working conditions, role definitions, evaluation and reward systems, and organizational structure as these encourage or inhibit effective faculty behaviors. This section also reviews governance arrangements and opportunities for professional development as predictors of faculty behaviors.

The report concludes by advancing a series of recommendations for achieving and maintaining effective learning environments drawn from the experiences of the case study institutions.

Design of The Study

The Ford Foundation funded Arizona State University in October 1987 to work in collaboration with a national sample of community colleges to:

1. identify faculty behaviors that contribute to educational equity where equity was defined to include both access and achievement.

2. survey faculty members to determine the emphasis they currently place on these behaviors.

3. identify the relationships between the incidence of effective faculty behaviors and administrative policies and practices.

The project was planned around three phases of activity. In the first, a comprehensive inventory of observable faculty behaviors was developed from three sources: the Miami-Dade Teaching/Learning project (Miami-Dade Community College 1988; Zwerling 1988), field interviews conducted with community college administrators, faculty members and students from the Maricopa County (Arizona) Community College District (Elliott 1992), and a review of the literature.

Faculty behaviors were combined into a survey, Educational Goals and Faculty Activities in the Community College (Appendix A). Factor analysis of the data from two pilot tests involving community colleges in Arizona, California, Florida, and Hawaii helped to refine 44 activity statements into a reliable and valid survey describing the range of professional activities that characterize the work of community college faculty members (Vangsnes 1992).

In Phase 2, the survey was administered to a random, stratified, national sample of 52 community colleges. Institutions with high proportions of African American, Latino, and Native American students were over-sampled. Sixty-seven percent of the faculty members surveyed provided useable responses. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated five reliable categories of faculty behavior: exhibiting effective teaching, helping diversely prepared students participate and achieve, helping students transfer, participating in governance, and conducting classroom research and collaborating. There were significant differences across institutions in the levels of behaviors reported for each of these categories (Murphy 1992).

During Phase 3, case studies were conducted in 12 community colleges, ten from the sample that completed the survey and two selected to improve geographic representation. To prepare

for the case study site visits, institutions appointed campus research teams who followed a common protocol to collect information from colleagues about institutional policies or practices that encouraged or discouraged effective faculty behaviors. The teams provided a key insider's perspective during site visits.

Procedures for conducting case studies and analyzing the results closely conformed to those suggested by Yin (1989) for multiple case studies. The case study data base included interviews with faculty members and administrators, institutional documents (including accreditation self-studies and evaluation team reports), collective bargaining agreements, archival data and the results of surveys.

Case reports were written to integrate everything known about an institution and shared with representatives for a "member check" on accuracy (Lincoln and Guba 1985, P.314-316). A single case was used to create an explanation of faculty behaviors in context. The explanation was then tested against each of the remaining cases and modified as necessary until as many differences in faculty behaviors across institutions as possible had been explained.

The Case Study Participants

Because participants were promised that published reports would avoid linking specific practices to identifiable institutions, fictitious names were assigned alphabetically according to the degree to which faculty and administrators described shared values focused on helping students achieve defined educational objectives. Faculty and administrators in institutions with first letters taken from the beginning of the alphabet generally reported agreement about priorities and they were to be achieved. Faculty input was sought out and valued by administrators. Structures and decision processes in the remaining institutions were more likely to have been shaped by conflict. There was less agreement about priorities and more energy expended on protecting separate domains. The two sets of institutions varied not only in the extent to which administrators and faculty shared values, but also in the degree to which values and attitudes emphasized student achievement.

Table 1 reports characteristics of the case study institutions summarized in four categories to conceal identities.

TABLE 1

Characteristics of Case Study Institutions

College	FT Faculty		FTE Students	
	N	%Min	N	%Min
Ashcroft				
Bentley	83-262	10-15	1,300-9,900	10-15
Creston				
Enfield				
Fairview	145-310	11-38	4,800-12,500	23-85
Goshen				
Johnson				
Kingston	100-251	21-33	6,000-17,000	45-95
Lakefield				
Norwich				
Oxbow	134-417	12-30	5,000-9,800	21-33
Parkhill				

Institutions at the extremes of the distribution tended to enroll fewer racial and ethnic minority students, although all of the institutions enrolled substantial and increasing minority populations partly because the study over-sampled institutions with high minority enrollments and partly because the study's focus on improving achievement for diverse students was an incentive for institutions with significant minority enrollments to participate. There were no obvious relationships between variables such as size of student body, number of faculty and percent minority, and organizational cultures.

Culture and Effective Faculty Behaviors

Culture helped to explain differences in faculty behaviors. Culture is defined by the assumptions and beliefs shared by members of an organization (Kuh and Whitt 1988). Culture develops over time among a group with an identifiable history as learned responses to the problems of maintaining internal cohesion and relating to the external community (Schein 1985). The cultures of the case study institutions provided clues to circumstances that contributed to effective faculty behaviors.

Culture as an Influence on Faculty Behaviors

At Ashcroft, faculty and administrators characterized the environment as "culture -- helping people where they are. We are a family." Administrators took pride in contributing to an environment where good ideas could emerge and be acted upon. Anecdotes defined the culture and reenforced the belief that Ashcroft placed great emphasis on innovation, creativity, and risk-taking. There was a "burning desire to do better." Faculty were treated as a key resource in working with the community and in problem solving.

Bentley is a closely knit community that attaches great importance to interpersonal relationships. The institution works because of good will and people. Administrators and faculty shared values centered on the importance of teaching and program quality, the development of student competencies and maintaining close linkages to the community. Faculty worked hard because the culture carried that expectation and they valued the culture as a "good place to work." As in most institutions, Bentley faculty sometimes talked among themselves about the lack of responsiveness from administrators and the "us versus them" environment. For the most part, however, both administrators and faculty seem reasonably satisfied with the way things work and have relatively little desire for change.

The way Creston works is somewhat mysterious, even to those who have been there for awhile. Most of the rules and procedures are not written down. In place of written policy statements, rituals and events identify Creston as an institution concerned about people and a cut above the average college. The culture provides pervasive encouragement for pursuing ideas which most of the time, according to institutional lore, originate from individual faculty members. Faculty were described as having a "strong, almost crusading, commitment to being there for students and a quality education." Creston clearly valued faculty members and was proud of their commitment and accomplishments.

At Enfield, responsibility for helping students succeed is placed on faculty who "own" the educational program. While policy documents spell out high expectations, most faculty believe they do what they do because of their commitment to students and not because of pressures from administrators. Faculty used the term "benign neglect" to describe an administrative environment that appeared neither threatening nor challenging. One faculty member said, "Administrators have not mobilized the faculty. They do not associate with them outside the institutional context." While some faculty members feel disenfranchised and unhappy, most continue to do a good job of teaching students and caring for them.

Faculty members at Fairview also "owned" the educational program and the courses they taught. Prominent among institutional lore is the story of the dean "who did not think that was the way it was" and who is no longer there. Faculty believe that teaching is important and that it needs to be done well. Faculty are committed to their departments where "there is a sense of family." Despite small numbers of non-performers and differences about the out-of-class role of faculty, the environment is one of commitment and caring. A faculty member summed up the Fairview culture, "the college allows a great deal of faculty autonomy which encourages experimentation and creativity ...[but] there is a total failure to take student academic needs seriously ... [also] missing is ... an ongoing student assessment of faculty."

There was substantial consensus among faculty and administrators at Goshen about the high quality of current faculty, their sources of satisfaction, and what it takes to be effective. A chair of one of the larger departments described the culture as one with "expectations about how faculty members will work with students...[that most follow]...both as a matter of professional pride and because they value their relationships with fellow faculty." Faculty prize working with students and are very available to them. But not all comments were positive. One faculty member described the environment as "things you avoid rather than things you work toward." Another said, "we have a strong sense of ownership of our courses, but the institution tends to kill it." The most important set of faculty concerns centers on the large numbers of adjunct staff who are perceived as a threat to program quality.

Faculty members at Johnson described "lots of enthusiasm and lots of caring among many faculty," and added, "Some faculty have a passion for doing what they do. They really project an attitude of caring." They also said, "People are turned off because nothing happens to recommendations. About two-thirds teach, don't keep office hours, and bug out as soon as they can." Another added, "Over time people have grown less

enthusiastic. They don't try new ideas. They don't even apply technology or the knowledge they know." A new faculty member said, "I came in with great enthusiasm. A colleague told me I should go home. Now I don't stay until 5:00 or 6:00 anymore."

At Kingston there was consensus that the faculty culture was strong and not easily influenced. As one administrator noted, "Boat rockers are not highly appreciated." From a faculty perspective, the system does not allow for innovation and the entire bureaucracy stifles innovation before it happens. The process of setting priorities at the campus was described by one administrator as "waiting to see if the train leaves the station headed in the right direction and if it does, to get on board."

Faculty members at Lakefield care about students and give them attention they would not receive elsewhere. The culture encourages a strong sense of faculty ownership of the educational program and the courses they teach. There is a core of committed faculty who are willing to confront the inertia of a large system and one of the oldest and strongest faculty unions in the country to achieve change consistent with the mission of the college. This small, but hardy band benefits from administrators who believe their most important strategy is to constantly encourage and support new ideas and to find resources for implementation.

At Norwich, most faculty members limit their involvement to classroom teaching and related student interaction. Frequent changes in leadership have left operating responsibilities, by default, to faculty members and mid-level administrators. Lack of consistent leadership from the top makes it difficult to define and pursue priorities. Departments and divisions are fiefs, where individual work goes forward, often at a very high level, but where little attempt has been made to coordinate or communicate across unit boundaries. Administrators pay faculty extra to take on such assignments as advising, or use released time to get faculty to buy into administrative priorities, but there was little evidence that they sought out and supported faculty ideas.

Extreme differences in style and philosophy among senior administrators produced an uneven administrative climate at Oxbow along with a declining number of committed faculty. One noted, "The percent of faculty opting out of active involvement is growing." A second faculty member continued the same theme: "Thirty percent of the faculty have stacked arms. How long do you beat them? They are getting angry." Confronted by reduced resources, the institution continued to emphasize enrollment growth. A senior administrator described the strategy: "...more and more of our teaching will be done

by part-timers; part-timers are as good in the classrooms as full-timers; however, they don't do the advising or committee work. As long as we have a core of full-time faculty, at least a third of whom will do the work, we are not worried about the percentage of instruction done by part-timers."

Parkhill is, to a remarkable extent, faculty-driven. In many ways, faculty own the institution and administrators must take into account the strong structure faculty have developed, the many faculty who have previously or are currently serving in positions of leadership, a strong collective bargaining agreement, and an institutional history where faculty have prevailed in conflicts with administrators. A faculty member explained, ". . faculty have been here longer than administrators, we have seen a lot of them come and go, and we're a lot smarter than they are. We do work with administrators, and we flex." The relatively modest expectations for faculty members at Parkhill are spelled out in a collective bargaining agreement. Faculty members were described as "oriented to minimum standards" and unlikely to engage in any behavior not mandated as a contractual obligation.

Defining Effective Faculty Behaviors

A model developed to explain the process through which colleges help a more diverse student population achieve high quality learning objectives without compromising access (Richardson and Skinner 1991) was used as a conceptual tool for expanding the five categories produced by factor-analyzing the survey data to eight that more fully captured the richness and diversity of student-related behaviors faculty members described during the site visits. Behaviors defining each category are reported below. The degree of overlap between site visit and survey data is also indicated.

Faculty members and administrators reported eight activities related to the first category, outreach and student recruiting. Two (items 3 and 8) were also included in the survey. Most faculty members reported little, if any, involvement in these behaviors.

1. Teach or advise in a summer enrichment program for K-12 students.
2. Teach in, or otherwise contribute to, an on-campus program for high-risk high school students (e.g. middle college high school).
3. Meet with high school faculty to improve student transition to college. (e.g. coordinate requirements in related courses).
4. Participate in a bridging program to identify, motivate, and prepare prospective high school

students in high demand majors (e.g. teaching, health-related, math, science, or engineering).

5. Contribute to a recruitment and retention program for educationally disadvantaged students (e.g. EOP, Talent Search, Upward Bound, Seek, etc.).
6. Teach an advanced placement, college credit class to high school students.
7. Serve as a mentor, or otherwise act as a resource, to a high school or junior high in an effort to motivate, enrich, and graduate "at-risk" students.
8. Help to recruit students.

Seven examples of the second category mentoring and advising were described. All but item 6 also appeared in the survey. Faculty were not heavily involved in serving as mentors or providing academic advising although practices varied widely across institutions. There was no consensus among faculty that these behaviors should be an expected part of their responsibilities.

1. Help students select classes as part of a registration process.
2. Advise students about administrative requirements for class withdrawal.
3. Help majors in your discipline select a sequence of courses that will transfer without loss of credit.
4. Help students complete administrative tasks for transfer to a four-year institution.
5. Help students find people or programs that will assist them in bridging to a four-year institution.
6. Serve as a mentor for one or more high-risk students.
7. As a trained student advisor, help students make informed decisions about college and careers.

A third category of faculty behaviors, academic support/learning assistance involved five examples of individual assistance faculty members provided outside of class. Three of the five (items 1,4 and 5) were included in the survey. Faculty reported high involvement in providing learning assistance and little difference of opinion about the importance of this category.

1. Be available outside of classes to help students with course-related problems.
2. Help organize tutoring services or train tutors.
3. Help staff a skill lab for your discipline.
4. Refer students who need more assistance than you can provide.
5. Help monitor student progress and provide early assistance to those in danger of failing.

The fourth category, labeled campus climate, included eight behaviors associated with making the campus more "user-

friendly." Two of the eight (items 7 and 8) were included in the survey. Faculty reported relatively low involvement in these behaviors along with substantial disagreement about the degree to which they should be involved.

1. Be sensitive to needs and backgrounds.
2. Build up confidence and self-esteem.
3. Show interest in students (e.g. know their names)
4. Be an advocate for their best interests.
5. Help students who feel "lost" in an unfamiliar culture.
6. Resolve questions in favor of the student.
7. Share personal experiences, cultural interests, and scholarly activities with students.
8. Work with students on co-curricular events and activities.

Category five, student assessment consisted of seven items, all but two of which (items 3 and 7) were also included on the survey. Faculty had high levels of involvement in student assessment and indicated little disagreement about the importance of these behaviors to their role.

1. Specify skill requirements for reading, writing, and math courses.
2. Develop or adopt appropriate measures for initial placement (e.g. writing samples, in-house math exams, standardized tests).
3. Require that all new students be correctly placed.
4. Identify prerequisites for advanced courses.
5. Describe course outcomes and required competencies in course outlines.
6. Monitor learning outcomes with performance measures.
7. Require specified performance criteria for the award of degrees.

Category six, Good Teaching Practices includes 11 behaviors that are professionally defining for community college faculty members. There was high involvement in these behaviors with little reported variation across institutions. Five of the behaviors (items 1,2,3,7 and 10) were also included in the survey.

1. Be competent in your discipline.
2. Show enthusiasm and love for subject matter.
3. Prepare consistently for classes.
4. Treat students with respect.
5. Exhibit a sense of humor.
6. Be fair in assessment practices.
7. Communicate effectively.
8. Meet objectives of the syllabus.
9. Use technology effectively (e.g. computer labs to individualize instruction).

10. Use regular student feedback to improve instruction.
11. Structure content to help students learn.

The seventh category, adaptive instruction involved 12 behaviors associated with providing alternative ways of learning and making content applicable to the ages, experiences, and cultures of a diverse student body. All but four of these behaviors (items 6,8,9, and 10) were also captured in the survey. Faculty were substantially less likely to engage in adaptive teaching behaviors than the more traditional categories of learning assistance, student assessment, and good teaching practices. Faculty members in community colleges with higher proportions of minority and nontraditional students were the most likely to emphasize adaptive teaching strategies.

1. Provide alternative ways of learning.
2. Explain content in ways students can understand and master.
3. Be creative in presenting materials and use real life examples.
4. Make materials applicable to students' lives (e.g. include course content that reflects student cultural backgrounds).
5. Provide students with more time to learn (e.g. open entry/open exit, incorporate extra conference/recital hour in regular three-credit course).
6. Provide a non-judgmental (comfortable) learning environment initially to build trust.
7. Use varied methods to assess student achievement.
8. Teach student success (e.g. learning to learn) courses.
9. Teach developmental courses.
10. Teach courses that help develop language proficiency.
11. Teach in a special program that blocks classes to encourage student networking.
12. Tailor instructional methods to the needs of a special group (e.g. high achieving, under-prepared, handicapped).

The final category, Emphasizing Academic Achievement consisted of five behaviors all but the first of which were included in the survey. Faculty engaged in high levels of these behaviors and reported relatively little disagreement about their importance.

1. Communicate the expectation that all students can succeed.
2. Balance caring behaviors with high expectations (e.g. hold students to standards).

3. Incorporate reading, writing, and problem solving in all classes (e.g. participate in a reading or writing across the curriculum project, teach critical thinking).
4. Teach study skills in all classes.
5. Provide timely and detailed feedback on performance.

While the survey did not include examples of all of the effective behaviors identified during site visits, it did include enough items in most categories to provide a credible estimate of the degree to which effective faculty behaviors differed among participating institutions. Table 2 reports the average level of reported faculty behaviors (mean) and the amount of variation (standard deviation) among faculty in the 52-institution sample and the case study institutions for which survey data were available.

TABLE 2

Faculty Behaviors: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for 10 Case Study Institutions (Case Study) and the 52 Institution Random Sample (Sample)

Faculty Behaviors	Means		Stand Dev	
	Sample	Case Study	Sample	Case Study
Outreach & Stud Recruit	49	50	33	33
Mentoring and Advising	64	65	28	28
Acad Supp/learn Assist	82	84	20	18
Campus Climate	68	70	26	25
Student Assessment	87	87	19	18
Good Teaching Practices	84	86	16	15
Adaptive Instruction	75	77	24	23
Emphasizing Achievement	79	81	22	23

The survey used a form of magnitude estimation scaling. Faculty members were asked to indicate the strength of their reaction to each statement as a description of their own behavior using the following scale:

0 = Statement does not describe behavior
5 = Neutral
10 = Statement Describes Behavior

All scores were multiplied by 10 to eliminate decimal points.

The results generally support the view of community colleges as institutions with a special commitment to student learning. The differences across institutions in reported levels of effective faculty behaviors, as determined by one-way analysis of variance exceeded the .01 level for all categories except academic support/learning assistance where it was .04. At the same time, the magnitude of these differences for some categories was quite small.

Faculty from all institutions reported high involvement (above 80) in student assessment, good teaching practices, and emphasizing achievement. Faculty reported lower levels of involvement (below 70) in mentoring and advising, and campus climate activities. The typical faculty member was not involved at all in outreach or student recruiting.

Faculty involvement ranged most widely for outreach and student recruiting, mentoring and advising, campus climate, adaptive instruction, and emphasizing achievement suggesting substantial disagreement about faculty role and responsibilities in these areas. The patterns of involvement were very similar for the 52 institution sample and the case study institutions.

A closer look at the ten case study institutions for which survey data were available reveals some interesting patterns. Where faculty members consistently reported higher levels of involvement in effective behaviors, institutions had a shared culture or at least a culture where faculty and administrative values did not conflict. The cultures of higher-ranking institutions were also consistent in the importance they attached to fostering high student achievement.

By contrast, institutions where faculty members reported lower levels of involvement were more likely to exhibit cultures that had grown out of conflict. Even where the issues, along with the protagonists, had disappeared, vestiges remained in assumptions as well as practices. While lower-ranked institutions were concerned about student achievement, they also devoted substantial effort to maintaining the boundaries between administrative and faculty prerogatives.

Table 3 displays the rankings on each of the eight categories.

TABLE 3

Survey of Faculty Behaviors: Institutional Ranks

College	O&SR	M/A	ASLA	CC	SA	GTP	AI	EA
Bentley	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	4
Creston	7	4	5	4	7	6	8	5
Enfield	2	6	2	5	4	3	1	1
Fairview	5	2	7	6	6	2	3	3
Goshen	6	8	3	3	3	1	5	2
Kingston	4	7	9	7	5	9	4	7
Lakefield	10	9	4	2	10	5	6	8
Norwich	3	10	6	8	2	7	7	6
Oxbow	9	5	8	10	8	10	9	10
Parkhill	8	3	10	9	9	8	10	9

The apparent linkages between culture and levels of effective behaviors suggest the need for additional analysis to explain low rankings for faculty within a highly cooperative culture and high rankings on some categories for faculty in a conflictive culture. Creston, for example, had one of the most supportive shared cultures, but ranked below the median on four of eight categories including student assessment, good teaching practices and adaptive instruction. Norwich and Parkhill with cultures shaped by conflict each ranked in the top three on at least one category.

Determinants of Community College Cultures

Because organizational culture is defined by the intangible assumptions and beliefs that shape behaviors, its nature must be inferred from observable characteristics of the organization. Job descriptions, policies for evaluation and rewards, organizational structure, governance arrangements and opportunities for professional development all provide clues to the way an institution's culture has been built and maintained. In this section of the report, differences in approaches to these structural issues are examined to capture in more descriptive detail the role of culture in shaping faculty behaviors.

Working Conditions and Role Definition

Not surprisingly, those institutions that expected more of their faculty got more. At Bentley the workload for faculty teaching, in both technical and transfer programs, was 18 hours a semester. Most of the faculty members averaged 21 credit hours. Faculty taught in the day and evening and accepted overloads without extra pay. It was not uncommon for a faculty member to have seven or eight different preparations in the course of a year. The typical faculty member spent more than 25 hours a week on campus. A department chair, referring to the faculty, said, "We have a bunch of high achievers who really like the self-recognition of achievement." Another described faculty members as "feeding on the positive reputation for excellent programs." A faculty member explained how peer relationships supported values, "The pressure here is if you are not doing your job, your fellow faculty members will be more difficult to get along with."

At Fairview, faculty who did not meet the 30-hour teaching requirement during the two semesters of the regular academic year were assigned teaching responsibilities during the first summer session to make up the difference. While full-time faculty were allowed to teach up to 12 contact hours per year as an overload, the practice was discouraged, and the compensation rate was so low that few did it. Under their collective bargaining agreement, faculty were responsible for performing student advising and assisting during registration. They were strongly encouraged, but not required, to be present at college-sponsored functions and activities.

At Oxbow, the teaching load was 24 units of instruction per year with a maximum of two preparations per semester. While faculty were required to maintain at least five posted office hours per week, there was no effective way of monitoring how these hours were spent, and faculty could choose not to consult with students on other than class-related concerns.

At Parkhill, faculty members suggested that the institution was very oriented towards minimum standards. One noted, "If you don't meet them, there is a sanction; but if you exceed them, there is no mechanism for recognizing excellence." Parkhill faculty met classes, posted office hours, helped staff governance committees, and hopefully met deadlines. For practical purposes, there was little accountability to administrators.

Institutions with higher-performing faculty differed from their counterparts not only in the amount of work they expected from faculty members but also in the way faculty role was defined. At Ashcroft, faculty responsibilities were carefully spelled out in job descriptions according to rank. For instructors the emphasis was on teaching, being available outside of the class to work with students, and participation in scheduled department, division, and college activities. Assistant professors added the responsibilities of course revision, academic advising, and some modest leadership activities. As faculty members progressed through the ranks, their responsibilities became both broader and more leadership-oriented.

Among institutions with lower-performing faculty, responsibilities tended to be very tightly circumscribed. At Norwich, for example, the contract did not require faculty participation in committee activity. "Beyond the classroom," explained one administrator, "there are only two ways of getting faculty members to do things. You can use involvement in committee or task force activity as a strategy or you can pay them." Because faculty were expected to limit their involvement to classroom teaching and related student interaction, most did.

Evaluation Systems and Rewards

Role expectations are supported and confirmed by arrangements for evaluating and rewarding faculty. However, most of the case study institutions did not link evaluation systems to either rank and promotion systems or merit. Those that did presented markedly more challenging environments for faculty than those that did not.

Ashcroft had the best developed arrangements for merit. Faculty exercised a strong influence in establishing or changing evaluation procedures. Faculty were rated as proficient or unsatisfactory on nine specified criteria and had to attain a rating of proficient in eight of the nine. Tenured faculty were evaluated every third year and the results used in the award of merit in two forms: at the division level, where the major focus was on teaching, and at

the college level, where a wide range of faculty responsibilities in addition to teaching were considered.

Ashcroft administrators described the purpose of merit as the reenforcement of behaviors the institution considered desirable. Part of the review process included optional interviews with persons who had applied for merit. Through these interviews, faculty work was made visible. Ashcroft administrators believed that most institutions make the mistake of limiting merit to too small a number of faculty. More than half of the faculty at Ashcroft received merit awards in any given year. Practices such as merit, deemed good for the faculty, were also applied to administrators.

At Fairview, tenured faculty were reviewed every five years, although administrators in theory could observe faculty members at any time without requesting an invitation. The evaluation process emphasized teaching and included achievements since the last review, peer evaluations, annual student evaluations, evaluation by the chair, and review at the department and college levels by joint faculty/ administrative committees. The results were closely linked to a highly competitive rank and promotion process which conferred both recognition and salary increases.

The evaluation process at Lakefield and its link to a competitive promotion process was similar to the one at Fairview, but the process emphasized significantly different values. While teaching was important at Lakefield, the criteria for promotion emphasized activities or outcomes that could be quantified and, as a faculty member noted, "The pressure is always to do things other than teaching." While faculty members criticized the mismatch between the values emphasized in evaluation and promotion and the faculty activities required to serve their students, they nonetheless emphasized strongly that a promotion system with mismatched values was still better than no promotion system at all. One added, "The absence of a promotion system has a devastating effect on faculty."

In commenting on the absence of linkages between evaluation and rewards, a faculty member at Enfield said, "Once a faculty member has tenure and commits office hours at the beginning of the semester, he can kick back and relax." The comment produced laughter. Other faculty members were quick to add that while this was possible, most would not engage in that kind of behavior. They argued that under such circumstances it was "up to the individual to be self-sustaining."

At Kingston there was no rank system and no merit pay. Faculty emphasized they "hoped there never would be" and added, "Rewards for good teaching were tried once; the process

was poorly planned and poorly executed, and was a disaster." Kingston's evaluation system emphasized improvement in performance. Tenured faculty were evaluated every five years in a process that included the submission of a self-evaluation, a classroom visit by another faculty member, student evaluations, and a review of other professional contributions to the college. Evaluation materials were examined by a committee consisting of other non-probationary faculty members in the discipline who conducted a structured conference with the faculty member and summarized the discussion in a written report furnished to the faculty member and the dean. A faculty member, after describing the process in detail, noted, "Short of senility or early Alzheimers, they leave you alone."

While the Kingston system was not linked to any arrangements for rewards or sanctions, it was still seen by some as a considerable effort to influence faculty behavior. Tenured faculty received a classroom visit from a peer and participated in the process of evaluating other faculty. The process was described by administrators as extremely important in helping to develop peer pressures and in keeping faculty informed about the activities of their colleagues.

Until very recently, it was not clear that Parkhill had an evaluation system. The faculty agreement described a fairly innocuous formative procedure. Under the terms of the agreement, promotion was virtually automatic for faculty meeting minimum academic and length-of-service requirements. Re-appointment was strongly influenced by unit and college committees, both of which were elected by the faculty. While Parkhill has been working on a new evaluation system, it had not been implemented at the time of the site visit. Even under the new system, both the re-appointment process and the promotion process will be essentially faculty-controlled, with little provision for administrative input except in acquiescing or rejecting a recommendation. Promotion remains automatic for those who meet minimum qualifications.

Faculty Structure

Almost all of the case study institutions used some form of combined department and division structure, but the role and importance of the department varied significantly. In colleges with higher-performing faculty, departments were valued as places where faculty gained leadership experience and where innovative ideas were incubated. Among colleges with lower-performing faculty, departments were tolerated or served as bastions of faculty autonomy virtually impervious to administrative influence. The amount of time available to department and divisional administrators was also a key variable.

At Ashcroft, faculty were organized into departments within divisions. While regarded as inefficient, departments were encouraged "to develop a seabed to let creative ideas emerge." Departments were viewed as nurturing and providing communication and support. Department chairs received a stipend and released time to carry out a formidable list of responsibilities.

There was little sense of hierarchy at Bentley despite a detailed organizational chart. For faculty departments were the key administrative unit. Divisions were less important, and some thought they were in the process of disappearing. Department chairs were said to motivate and coach faculty.

At Goshen, faculty liked the department structure and appreciated a chair who understood their discipline. The most valued chairs protected faculty from unreasonable demands upon their time and supported them in activities that were mutually valued. While department chairs were perceived as a strength, they were also viewed by administrators as a considerable barrier to change. Chairs were appointed from the faculty and described as staying "until they do something terribly wrong." Recently Goshen has begun to use annual faculty evaluation of department chairs as a basis for counseling some chairs to return to the faculty. The work of chairs is not easy. A faculty member said, "They have very little power. You have to deal with irate faculty, administrators, and students with no guns in your holster."

Johnson faculty were organized into divisions, each of which determined by vote the number and composition of its departments. Department "spokespersons" were elected for a two-year period. The number of departments depended upon who was willing to do the job and the acceptability of that person to faculty. Spokespersons received stipends but no released time. Their level of activity varied significantly. Faculty believed administrators at Johnson did not like the idea of departments and had tried to keep them as weak as possible.

Faculty members at Kingston were also organized into divisions. While chairpersons were defined as key educational leaders in district documents, they were expected to carry out their responsibilities with a load reduction of 40 percent. Faculty members believed "division chairs were pseudo-administrators who shuffle papers. No important decisions occur at that level." Faculty were uniformly unenthusiastic about the division structure.

At Oxbow, where faculty took the initiative to improve mentoring and advising despite a confrontational environment, the department was the vitalizing factor for faculty.

Division meetings, in contrast, were perceived as presenting the official face of the institution.

The collective bargaining agreement at Parkhill specified 33 different academic units into which faculty were organized. These units were overseen by coordinators who were for practical purposes selected by the faculty. Coordinators had broad responsibilities but did not evaluate faculty. Parkhill also had a division structure but no division administrators. General education and developmental education were organized into programs without faculty. These units were required to contract with academic departments for the staffs they needed to carry out their responsibilities.

The Special Case of Multiple Campus Districts

Seven of the colleges were part of districts that supervised more than a single, comprehensive campus. The districts varied substantially in conceptual approach, ranging from a single college with multiple locations to arrangements where each college in theory operated as an autonomous unit. In practice, most district structures were perceived as controlling rather than coordinating or facilitating. The district influence on institutional quality appeared to vary inversely with the degree of standardization district administrators sought to impose.

At Creston, responding to extensive direction from the district office without stifling faculty initiative and enthusiasm was a task of no mean proportions. As one example, the creation and revision of curriculum, while very much faculty-based, relied on curriculum committees organized by discipline in a district structure. Administrators and faculty members alike described the cumbersome process as "a wonderful system for ensuring that nothing changes very fast." Division chairs described spending two and a half days a week in district meetings before doing any business on campus. Creston had a positive and nurturing environment in part because its administrators devoted considerable energy to shielding the college from unnecessary intrusions by the district. Creston administrators were told to focus on the non-routine, the unique responsibilities where they could make a difference. Priorities were clearly defined at each opening convocation and focused on teaching and learning, defined as building community and building learning community.

At Enfield, one administrator noted, "The college has several campuses but acts as if it has only one." Teaching faculty members were organized in district-wide divisions that reported to a district-wide vice president. While the arrangements created some communication problems, they did not

seem to affect adversely the commitment, enthusiasm or dedication of Enfield's faculty.

Goshen used a similar arrangement and benefitted as well from a district administration with a history of avoiding micro-management. District administrators evidenced considerable willingness to live with faculty decisions as long as they did not create chaos. They were equally reluctant to impose solutions on faculty from outside. The single college approach, unusual for a district as large as Goshen, along with a very sparse administrative structure on each of the campuses, prevented the endless meetings that characterized some similar sized multi-campus districts. There were no complaints about communication, and the faculty focus was clearly on problem-solving.

The weight of structure and processes in the multi-campus district to which Johnson belonged was increased by a hands-on, top-down administrative style. The curriculum process began on a campus "if it begins at all," said a faculty member, and involved coordination across departments, across campuses, and through a labyrinth of committees. An administrator at Johnson described how a new evaluation procedure evolved: "The district has a shared governance committee involving about 8000 people, a shared governance steering committee with about 2000 people, and a subcommittee of the shared governance steering committee which deals with evaluation and involves about 1500 people." A senior administrator at Johnson added, "Symptomatically, multi-campus districts have enormous trouble getting anything done."

At Kingston, a strong district administrator and equally strong, and almost as autonomous, faculty presented campus administrators with the difficult task of negotiating between two 500-pound gorillas. Faculty and campus administrators were critical of such perceived district practices as putting resources into areas that didn't directly involve students, committing funds to get students into the institution but not to ensure their success, an emphasis on numbers, and live-and-let-live arrangements that allowed lead faculty to block needed course offerings. Faculty members, when asked about the advice they would give to a new faculty member, said, "Get a mentor to guide and inform you about how to work through the bureaucracy . . . an honest source of information." Orientation for new faculty was described as "Bureaucracy 101. The orientation teaches faculty how to work within the system; mentors can teach you how to beat it."

At Lakefield, district values embedded in the evaluation and promotion process encouraged faculty members to spend less time helping a diverse student body achieve and more time on

activities traditionally associated with faculty in four-year institutions.

Like Goshen, Parkhill described itself as a single college operating in several locations. However, each campus had its own administrative structure, and there was a well-defined central district staff. Relationships between central district staff and campus administrators had deliberately been left ambiguous, as were arrangements describing the relationships between academic units common to more than a single campus. The strong orientation to minimum standards and faculty domination of institutional decision making seemed to contribute more than district structure to lower participation in effective behaviors.

Faculty Involvement in Governance

Among institutions where faculty members reported higher levels of involvement in effective behaviors, participation in governance was encouraged by institutional arrangements that left decisions in doubt. Neither administrators nor faculty, acting unilaterally, could secure their objectives. In institutions where faculty reported lower levels of involvement, comprehensive collective bargaining agreements or board policies narrowly defined faculty role, protected those who opted out of all responsibilities other than meeting classes, and permitted senior faculty or administrative leaders unilaterally to prevent change with which they disagreed.

At Ashcroft, a representative faculty senate had the responsibility, "to review, recommend and initiate policies to further the best interests of Ashcroft." While the charter is broad, in practice the senate has been most keenly interested in welfare, working conditions, and salary; and much less excited about other issues. The balance between faculty and administrative influence in the decision-making process is key. An administrator said: "Reciprocal nudging is our theme. The faculty nudge us just as we nudge them back." Faculty input was sought out, valued, and used. Ashcroft faculty are not organized for collective bargaining. The issue of organizing is raised periodically, but it seems to be used mainly as a club to encourage administrators to be responsive to faculty concerns.

At Bentley, faculty are involved in governance in the sense that they help to determine programs through the curriculum committee and there is a college council that involves staff as well as faculty. When changes to the policy manual affecting faculty are made, they are consulted. Faculty members at Bentley said the college council was not used very much. Governance issues are dealt with primarily through

mutual accommodation between individual faculty members and administrators. People generally believed that constrained resources were openly and fairly administered. While the institution described itself as "in a planning mode," administrators readily admitted that most of the formal planning was done in response to state mandates.

Because very little is written about Creston procedures, it is difficult to be certain of the level of faculty involvement in governance. Different people provided different estimates. The best guess seemed to be that committee service was not central to Creston culture despite district policy which described such service as a faculty responsibility. The committee system worked because middle-level administrators made it work. Faculty were involved in governance primarily through a faculty association, which existed largely to represent faculty interests to the board of trustees and the district administration.

At Enfield, a faculty association advanced policy recommendations to a president's cabinet, which might or might not advance them to the board. From a faculty perspective, there were "umpteen faculty committees," some more active than others. However, opinions about the effectiveness of committees and the governance process varied. Faculty said that something happened if the right person chaired the committee; otherwise recommendations simply disappeared. Enfield made extensive use of the charrette process to involve faculty in discussing problems. A faculty noted: "Charrettes are a lot of fun to go to. They charge you up. All those wonderful ideas. Then you leave and 'boff,' nothing happens. They should be renamed one-day retreats." Faculty believed that Enfield needed a "mature and well-developed system of governance."

Only Fairview, among the institutions with more involved faculty, had a collective bargaining agreement. Beyond specifying curriculum development procedures, however, the contract made little reference to faculty involvement in governance or to academic structure. Fairview did not have an active faculty senate. A college council, comprised of representatives from all college constituencies, met twice a year at the call of the president "to promote communication among all college constituencies; to provide a forum for the exchange of major institutional concerns; to act as a sounding board for the president on matters of general importance; and to give the president a 'general sense of the college.'"

While Kingston was not involved in collective bargaining, a strong, representative academic senate served as a regular channel of communication between the faculty and the administration. The charge to the senate was sufficiently

broad to encompass any topic either faculty or administrators chose to bring before it. In many ways the senate resembled the marriage of an academic senate to an in-house union. A committee of the district academic senate recommended revisions in salary and working conditions. District policy provided that no changes would be proposed in board policies, district regulations, or procedures related to faculty welfare without consultation.

At Lakefield, faculty were represented by a strong union which had created, through collective bargaining, a faculty-dominated promotion process. Faculty were involved in evaluating their colleagues and in making personnel decisions. While administrators were represented at all stages of decision-making, the process clearly rested most centrally on faculty recommendations. The strength of Lakefield faculty inhibited change from the top. Faculty determined for themselves what was important. Introducing new ideas was very difficult.

The collective bargaining agreement at Norwich was also quite comprehensive, incorporating a very liberal interpretation of terms and conditions of appointment. Many of the contract provisions seemed to be attempts to insulate faculty from the instability that has characterized leadership at the top for the past two decades. In pursuing this objective, negotiators have also succeeded in insulating faculty from administrative leadership, regardless of how well intentioned or benign. To build consensus on issues related to teaching, learning, and professional activities, Norwich has recently established an academic senate and a college committee structure. The president of the faculty association (normally the faculty union president) exercises near veto power over any senate agenda item within the scope of the collective bargaining agreement. Norwich has experienced difficulties in getting faculty members to serve on the committees.

Faculty at Oxbow had a hard time deciding what the priorities were. They said, "The college lacks a vision. There is no sense of priority; everything is important." Asked where Oxbow fell on a continuum between faculty dominance and administrative dominance, a senior administrator said, "In the middle. Faculty and administrators keep each other within a fairly narrow range of activity."

Oxbow had the most elaborate governance structure among the study institutions. Elaborate arrangements for appeal of adverse presidential responses to Council recommendations, including detailed mediation procedures, reflected the conflict out of which the council came. Faculty valued the system they had fought to establish. "We have devised it, and it works well. We don't have trouble getting people to serve."

Administrators described the council as "unproven" and differed about its purposes. Some saw the council as a device for improving communication and involving faculty in decision-making, while others viewed it as a strategy for diffusing conflict.

An extremely comprehensive collective bargaining agreement at Parkhill defined faculty responsibilities, specified academic organization, and described in detail the procedures through which faculty participated in decision-making. In the absence of other governance arrangements, the contract over time became the instrument for change, incorporating both governance and academic issues. The governance procedures specified in the contract were described by one faculty member as a "system of checks and balances." Another faculty member noted that the procedures involved older faculty "who have learned to adapt to all the nuances of our complex environment." Faculty in times past have prevailed in conflicts with administrators. Successful administrators must work through faculty structures playing a supporting role. Most new initiatives are carried out by faculty members on released time.

The survey included four items designed to measure faculty involvement in governance: participate in college planning, serve on governance committees, serve on college task forces, and support administrative priorities. Faculty in institutions with higher levels of effective behaviors were more likely to report participation in governance than those in institutions with lower levels despite the more complex governance procedures of the latter. As indicated by Table 4, institutions where faculty reported the lowest levels of involvement in governance were, without exception, represented by a collective bargaining agent.

TABLE 4

Involvement in Governance: Institutional Ranks

B	C	E	F*	G	K	L*	N*	O*	P*
1	5	2	7	3	4	10	6	8	9

* Institution had a collective bargaining agent.

Professional Development

Institutions with higher levels of effective behaviors (with the exception of Fairview, where resources were extremely constrained) provided more extensive opportunities for professional development and related these opportunities more systematically to institutional priorities. In institutions

with lower levels of effective behaviors, it was sometimes difficult to identify priorities, and participation in professional development was largely a matter of individual choice. In some of these institutions, administrators admitted they had largely given up attempts to change levels of effective behaviors, pegging their hopes for change on the replacement of existing faculty when they retired.

At Ashcroft the evaluation, recognition, and professional development arrangements were carefully designed to build on each other and to be mutually supportive. Faculty had a major voice in determining the policies and practices that governed these systems. Faculty members nonetheless emphasized, "What we do, we do because we are teachers and we are professionals."
While the incentives and rewards offered at Bentley were quite limited, each faculty member completed a personal professional development form containing goals and objectives and a statement about the degree to which their goals had been achieved. While faculty members reported filling out the form backwards, that is, they first described what they had done and then completed the section that described goals and objectives, the process encouraged them to relate behaviors to institutional priorities. Personal development forms were the subject of a careful review by the better department chairs.

The extensive faculty development opportunities at Creston were closely linked to institutional priorities and celebrated excellence in teaching. The process for taking advantage of opportunities, however, was informal and voluntary. For faculty members who chose to participate, the culture provided recognition and reinforcement. Full-time faculty members talked to each other, and their enthusiasm was contagious.

At Goshen the district planning process was used to coordinate and enhance professional development. Faculty members were pulled out of departments to participate in district-wide planning, issue development or program implementation. They returned as advocates of new ideas within their departments. An administrator with military experience described this arrangement as "the best way to take a bridge -- both ends at the same time." Because of its flat organization, Goshen also made extensive use of faculty who had previously shown some inclination toward leadership. Grants were used systematically to support professional development priorities.

At Kingston there was no obvious relationship between professional development opportunities and district priorities. While Kingston did provide tuition and fee remission for graduate course-work, in-service days, a writing-across-the-curriculum project, and education development grants, there was no sense among either faculty or

administrators that these opportunities were equal to the task of energizing a satisfied and well-protected senior faculty.

The basic mode of faculty development for Norwich has been involvement in committees. The college had not devoted much time to planning a systematic direction for the activity that has occurred. Departments controlled the annual professional development day called for by the contract and the activities selected might or might not reflect institutional priorities.

Recently, Parkhill has placed increased emphasis on professional development. While one faculty member noted the intrinsic appeal in the opportunity to be involved in activities that subverted the way the institution had been accustomed to doing business, there was little evidence of widespread faculty participation. Senior faculty received released time to provide leadership in improving student achievement, but the efforts of individual faculty and the supportive behaviors of administration were insufficient to overcome the numbers of faculty who exercised their prerogatives to remain unengaged.

The survey included four items related to participation in professional development: attend professional meetings, collaborate in designing courses or teaching, attend staff development sessions, and set challenging self-performance goals. Table 5 displays institutional ranks for faculty participation in professional development among the ten institutions with survey results.

Faculty members in institutions reporting higher levels of effective student-related behaviors were significantly more likely to report participation in professional development.

TABLE 5

Participation in Professional Development: Institutional Ranks

B	C	E	F	G	K	L	N	O	P
3	4	1	6	2	5	8	9	7	10

Predicting Effective Faculty Behaviors

Job descriptions, evaluation systems and organizational structures change slowly in most institutions because they are typically embedded in collective bargaining agreements or comparably difficult-to-change board policies. Most efforts to encourage higher levels of effective faculty behaviors

therefore focus on increasing involvement in defining and solving institutional problems through regular governance procedures or special task forces. Faculty participation in more systematic professional development programs is also emphasized. Table 6 uses survey data to estimate the impact of involvement in governance (Gov) and participation in professional development (Pro D) on reported levels of involvement in effective faculty behaviors.

TABLE 6

Involvement in Governance and Professional Development As Predictors of Effective Faculty Behaviors

Faculty Behaviors	Multiple Correlation (R)		Explained Variance (Adj R^2)	
	Gov	Pro D	Gov	Pro D
Outreach & Stud Recruit	.45	.44	.19	.18
Mentoring & Advising	.45	.43	.20	.19
Acad Supp/learn Assist	.43	.51	.18	.25
Campus Climate	.43	.42	.18	.18
Student Assessment	.33	.43	.11	.18
Good Teaching Practices	.38	.59	.14	.35
Adaptive Instruction	.49	.60	.23	.35
Emphasizing Achievement	.42	.57	,17	.32

Faculty who are involved in governance or professional development are far more likely to report high levels of involvement in all eight categories of effective behaviors than their less involved counterparts. The relationship between professional development and good teaching practices, adaptive instruction and emphasizing achievement is particularly striking with approximately a third or more of the total variance for each of these effective behaviors explained by participation. Professional development is the stronger predictor for five of the eight categories, all of which are closely related to teaching (academic support/learning assistance, student assessment, good teaching practices, adaptive instruction and emphasizing achievement). These relationships seem reasonable given the focus of professional development activities described during the site visits.

Involvement in governance was as strong a predictor of the remaining three categories (outreach and student recruitment, mentoring and campus climate) as participation in professional development.

These results suggest that institutions are well-advised to involve faculty in decision-making and to invest in professional development programs that emphasize institutional priorities. Faculty who reported higher levels of participation in governance and professional development on the survey also reported higher levels of effective student-related behaviors.

Creating Effective Learning Environments

Administrators in community colleges where faculty report higher levels of effective behaviors create and defend cultures where faculty input is sought out, valued, and used. The faculty role is broadly defined. Behaviors valued in faculty are modeled by administrators. Priorities are clearly identified, and focus on teaching and learning. Administrators are open and fair in the internal distribution of available resources. An accountability structure, jointly defined, balances administrative and faculty influence. Administrators support rituals and tell stories that illustrate and reinforce the attitudes and beliefs that define culture.

In community colleges where faculty report lower levels of effective behaviors, complex administrative and governance structures substitute for shared values and mutual accommodation. There is no consensus about priorities. Faculty members are oriented toward meeting the minimum standards spelled out in restrictive contracts or board policies. Administrators rely on extra compensation to encourage faculty members to become involved beyond minimum requirements. In many institutions with lower levels of effective behaviors, faculty seem to be dominant, or at least well protected.

In institutions with higher levels of effective behaviors, administrators made decisions and provided leadership, however low-key. In institutions with lower levels administrators persuaded, influenced, supported, or, in some instances, confronted, but they did not seem to develop any sort of shared vision of what the institution hoped to achieve. The institutions with higher levels of effective behaviors had cultures that brought people together. While these cultures, in some instances, tolerated a lack of involvement, they did not encourage it. Among the institutions with lower levels, the presence of competing cultures and formal safeguards allowed faculty members to opt out of active participation.

The following propositions summarize the impact of institutional environments on faculty practice of behaviors that contribute to student persistence and academic achievement.

1. Importance of Culture Community colleges with higher levels of effective behaviors have organizational cultures where administrators and faculty share values centered on the importance of promoting student achievement.

   Those with lower levels, while also concerned about student achievement, have cultures where administrative values and faculty values clash, or where faculty values

predominate. Translating concern for student achievement into effective institutional responses is more difficult and more time-consuming.

2. Expectations and Role Definition Community colleges with higher levels of effective behaviors expect more from faculty and define the role more broadly. Faculty are encouraged to practice the entire range of behaviors that influence student retention and achievement.

   In those with lower levels, faculty can limit their responsibilities to teaching assigned classes and to class-related student interaction without encountering peer criticism or institutional sanctions.

3. Evaluation Policies, Rewards and Recognition Community colleges with higher levels of effective behaviors have evaluation policies that involve administrators, other faculty members and students in regular, collaborative reviews of teaching performance. Valuative criteria set high expectations, reflect shared values and encompass the entire range of faculty responsibilities. Rewards and recognition are linked to the outcomes of the evaluation process.

   Evaluation policies in community colleges with lower levels of effective behaviors are either a poor match for institutional priorities or are applied at such infrequent intervals as to have little, if any, influence on the behaviors of continuing faculty members who meet minimum and narrowly defined expectations.

4. Faculty Structure Community colleges with higher levels of effective behaviors support departments as grassroots structures for developing faculty leadership and encouraging involvement in problem solving and improving learning environments.

   In community colleges with lower levels, departments or comparable structures are tolerated, but serve primarily to protect faculty interests or provide routine administrative assistance to division chairs.

5. Multi-campus Districts Community colleges with higher levels of effective behaviors either function within districts where central administrators have limited their demands for standardization and coordination, or they have campus leaders who have been successful in finding ways to buffer faculty from influence attempts by central administration.

In community colleges with lower levels, system values and bureaucratization stifle faculty creativity and limit the amount of time and discretionary resources campus administrators can devote to improving campus learning environments.

6. Governance Faculty in institutions with higher levels of effective behaviors are encouraged to participate in governance by doubts about the outcomes if they are absent. Structural arrangements balance faculty and administrative influence. Shared values make the search for alternatives to existing practice a tolerable, if not comfortable experience.

   Faculty members in institutions with lower levels experience a predictable decision making environment. Faculty leaders can keep the search for alternatives to current practice within fairly narrow boundaries. Structural arrangements, often embedded in legally binding contracts, aid faculty leaders in protecting their constituents from unwanted change. The process is tolerant of substantial disengagement by most faculty members and provides few, if any, incentives for involvement beyond the leadership cadre.

7. Professional Development Institutions with higher levels of effective behaviors use professional development opportunities as part of a systematic effort to pursue priorities that have been legitimated, if not developed, through the governance process. More faculty participate, reflecting greater levels of engagement in all facets of their professional life.

   In community colleges with lower levels, professional development opportunities reflect efforts to encourage faculty to respond to administrative priorities. Fewer faculty participate, because higher proportions are disengaged from activities beyond meeting their classes and keeping required office hours.

   Professional development opportunities are heavily influenced by external grants. Student numbers and student diversity increase more rapidly than resources in most community colleges inhibiting their capacity to invest in other than basic services.

References

Elliott, D.C. (1992) Community College Faculty Behaviors Impacting Transfer Student Success: A Qualitative Study. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985) Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Kuh, G.D. and Whitt, E.J. (1988) The Invisible Tapestry: Culture in American Colleges and Universities." Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, ASHE/ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 1.

McCabe, R. (1989-1990) The Miami-Dade Community College Teaching/Learning Project Summary Report, Miami, Florida: Summary Report (year four).

Miami-Dade Community College (October 1988) Faculty Excellence: Teaching/Learning. Miami, Florida: District Board of Trustees.

Murphy, B. (1992) The Role of Community College Faculty in Improving the Learning Environment. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Richardson, R.C. Jr. and Skinner, E.F. (1991) Achieving Quality and Diversity: Universities in a Multicultural Society. New York: ACE/Macmillan.

Schein, E.H. (1985) Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vangsnes, D. (1992) Development of a Community College Faculty Activities Survey. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Yin, R.K. (1989) Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Zwerling, L.S. (1988) "The Miami-Dade Story: Is It Really Number one?" Change, Vol. 20, No. 1, January/February 1988.

Appendix A

Educational Goals and Faculty activities in The Community College

NATIONAL CENTER FOR POSTSECONDARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE
RESEARCH CENTER AT ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

Educational Goals and Faculty Activities in the Community College

A Research Project Funded by the Ford Foundation

This project has been approved by the Arizona State University Human Subjects Research Review Committee as incorporating appropriate safeguards to guarantee the confidentiality of participant responses.

Introduction

Today Community Colleges are going through many changes. Plans for the future begin with a better understanding of the attitudes of current faculty members about the educational priorities of the institutions they serve. This survey asks you to provide information about six institutional goals and 44 activities in the community college setting

DIRECTIONS FOR PART 1

Please answer each of the statements as shown in the following examples.

Each statement asks you to answer two questions:

1. Is this **important to do?** *Here you show how much you agree that the item is important for your Community College to do.*

2. **Is this being done well?** ***Here you show how much*** *you agree that the item is* ***now being done well at this*** *Community College.* If the item is not being done currently at your Community College mark the zero (not a goal here) response.

Please read the following examples carefully.

Example 1

All questions are about **this** Community College, that is, the one at which you are presently employed.

Cross through one number after **important to do** and one after **being done well.**

Not a Goal Here
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral or No opinion
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

This Community College should...		
Provide off-campus vocational programs.	Important To Do	(1) (2) **(3)** (4) (5)
	Being Done Well	**(1)** (2) (3) (4) (5) (0)

This first example shows that the person answering is **neutral** (that is, neither agrees nor disagrees and/or has no opinion) about the importance of this item but **strongly disagrees** that his/her Community College is currently offering such programs very well.

Example 2

Fund faculty research.	Important To Do	(1) (2) (3) (4) **(5)**
	Being Done Well	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) **(0)**

This second example shows that the person answering **strongly agrees** that funding research is **important to do**, but does not believe this is a goal at his/her Community College.

Example 3

Develop a booster organization to support intercollegiate athletics.	Important To Do	**(1)** (2) (3) (4) (5)
	Being Done Well	(1) (2) (3) (4) **(5)** (0)

This third example shows that the person answering strongly disagrees that developing booster organizations is **imporant**, but **strongly agrees** that it is being **done well.**

All questions are about **this** Community College, that is, the one at which you are presently employed.

Cross through one number after **Important to do** and one after **being done well**.

This Community College should...

Not a Goal Here
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral or No Opinion
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

1. Help students overcome deficiencies in academic preparation.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. Enroll students representative of racial and ethnic diversity in the area served.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. Help students develop or improve job-related skills.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. Provide accessible academic programs.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. Help students progress toward the baccalaureate degree.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. Provide high quality academic programs.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0

PART II FACULTY ACTIVITIES

Directions

Part II of this instrument is concerned with actual activity of faculty at their institution. The response format asks:

1. Does this statement describe your activity at your college?

Use a different scale of 0—10 where 5 is neutral and 0 indicates you feel very strongly the item **does not describe** your activity and 10 indicates you feel very strongly the item **does describe** your activity. If you have no opinion you may also use a neutral (5) score.

Example

Each of the following statements describes an activity in which a community college faculty member might engage. In terms of the following questions: Does this statement describe your current activity?	0 ——— 5 ——— 10 does not describe — neutral — describes
1. Provide detailed course study guides	Describes Actvity 0 1 2 3 4 5 **X** 7 8 9 10

This person feels mildly that the item describes his/her activity at the college.

FACULTY ACTIVITIES

Each of the following statements describes an activity in which a community college faculty member might engage. In terms of the following questions: Does this statement describe your current activity?	0 ——— 5 ——— 10 does not describe — neutral — describes
1. Provide students with frequent assessment of learning progress.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. Advise students on courses that count toward degrees at four-year institutions.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*Some of the items in this section were developed by the Faculty Excellence Subcommittee of the Miami-Dade Community College Teaching/Learning Project. They are used with the permission of the College.

Each of the following statements describes an activity in which a community college faculty member might engage. In terms of the following question: Does this statement describe your current activity?	0 — 5 — 10 does not describe — neutral — describes
3. Attend meetings of professional associations.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. Provide a written statement of course requirements and evaluation procedures at the beginning of the semester.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. Collaborate with colleagues across disciplines in designing and teaching courses.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6. Describe the academic demands of four-year institutions.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
7. Collaborate with high school teachers in related fields.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
8. Conduct classroom research to improve teaching effectiveness.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
9. Check student learning by use of questioning techniques.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
10. Help students get to know each other in class.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
11. Present ideas clearly.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
12. Refer students who are inadequately prepared for your course to an alternative course placement.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
13. Attend staff development meetings.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
14. Work with students on co-curricular events and activities.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Each of the following statements describes an activity in which a community college faculty member might engage. In terms of the following question: Does this statement describe your current activity?	0 ——— 5 ——— 10 does not describe — neutral — describes
15. Set challenging performance goals for yourself.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
16. Advise students about administrative requirements for withdrawal from a course.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
17. Provide students with alternative ways of learning.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
18. Participate in college planning.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
19. Describe career options related to course content.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
20. Teach critical thinking through problem-solving activities.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
21. Relate content and assignments to students of varying ages and experiences.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
22. Know your subject matter.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
23. Require students to demonstrate competencies essential to success in subsequent coursework.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
24. Help students complete administrative task for transfer to a four-year institution.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
25. Make yourself available to students outside of class.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
26. Teach study skills and test taking strategies essential to success in your class.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Each of the following statements describes an activity in which a community college faculty member might engage. In terms of the following question: Does this statement describe your current activity?	0 ——— 5 ——— 10 does not describe — neutral — describes
27. Document student learning.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
28. Encourage the formation of study groups through assignments.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
29. Display enthusiasm in your work.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
30. Help students find people or programs that will assist them in bridging to a four-year institution.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
31. Serve on committees considering issues related to faculty compensation or working conditions.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
32. Prepare carefully for class presentations.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
33. Integrate current subject matter into your teaching.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
34. Challenge well-prepared students by special assignments or referrals.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
35. Share personal experiences and scholarly activities with students.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
36. Take the initiative in helping students who need assistance.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
37. Work with students to help them clarify educational goals.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
38. Relate content and assignment to students of varying racial and cultural backgrounds.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Each of the following statements describes an activity in which a community college faculty member might engage. In terms of the following question: Does this statement describe your current activity?	0 ——— 5 ——— 10 does not describe — neutral — describes
39. Participate in policymaking by serving on college task forces or committees.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
40. Refer students who are having difficulty to learning laboratories and tutonal assistance.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
41. Assist in the recruitment of students.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
42. Require essay tests and other written assignments.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
43. Support administrative priorities.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
44. Set challenging performance goals for students.	Describes Activity 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION VICTORIA COLLEGE

How many hours do you typically teach per semester?_____

What is your primary teaching field? _____

Your Comments: **Please use this space for any comments you have regarding this survey.**

_____

_____

_____

_____